Case 2:15-cr-20652-GCS-DRG ECF No. 1508 filed 02/09/19 PageID.20532 Page 1 of 39

1 MICHAEL A. RATAJ, ESQ. On behalf of Quincy Graham 2 JAMES L. FEINBERG, ESQ. 3 On behalf of Robert Brown, II CHRISTOPHER M. SEIKALY, ESQ. 4 On behalf of Jerome Gooch 5 DOUGLAS R. MULLKOFF, ESQ. On behalf of Michael Rogers 6 BARTON W. MORRIS, JR. 7 On behalf of Derrick Kennedy 8 9 10 To Obtain Certified Transcript, Contact: Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, Official Court Reporter 11 Theodore Levin United States Courthouse 231 West Lafayette Boulevard, Room 1067 Detroit, Michigan 48226 12 (313) 962-1234 13 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription. 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Case 2:15-	cr-20652-GCS-DRG	ECF No.	150	8 fi	led (	12/0	<b>9</b> /19	PageID.2	20554	Page 3 of 39
					_	_				
1			I	N	D	E	X			
2										Page
3	Status Confere	nce								4
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14		_			_	_	_			
15	T-1	E	X	н	В	Ι	Т		a	Danainad
16	<u>Identification</u>							Offere	<u>a</u>	Received
17		N		^		ът				
18		N		0		N		E		
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
	15	-20652;	USA	v.	BII	LLY	ARN	IOLD, ET	AL	

1	Detroit, Michigan
2	Monday, November 21, 2016
3	
4	
5	THE CLERK: Case Number 15-20652, United
6	States of America versus Billy Arnold, Steven Arthur,
7	Eugene Fisher, Corey Bailey, Quincy Graham, Robert Brown,
8	Jerome Gooch, Michael Rogers, Derrick Kennedy.
9	THE COURT: Good morning.
10	MR. GRAVELINE: Chris Graveline and Raj
11	Prasad on behalf of the United States, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Welcome.
13	MR. MORRIS: Barton Morris on behalf of
14	Derrick Kennedy.
15	MS. MANNARINO: Good morning. Maria
16	Mannarino on behalf of Defendant Number 1, Mr. Billy
17	Arnold.
18	MR. KOSELKE: Good morning. Eric Koselke on
19	behalf of Billy Arnold.
20	MR. MCMANUS: Your Honor, John McManus for
21	Steven Arthur. Good morning.
22	MR. RATAJ: Good morning, your Honor. Mike
23	Rataj on behalf of Mr. Quincy Graham.
24	MR. MULLKOFF: Doug Mullkoff on behalf of
25	Michael Rogers.

MR. SEIKALY: Christopher Seikaly on behalf 1 2 of Jerome Gooch. MR. SCHARG: Good morning, your Honor. Henry 3 Scharg on behalf of Eugene Fisher, Number 3 on the 4 indictment. 5 MR. MINOCK: Good morning. If it please the 6 7 Court, John Minock on behalf of Corey Bailey. 8 MR. FEINBERG: James L. Feinberg, attorney 9 for Robert Brown. 10 THE COURT: Mr. Spielfogel is on the phone. 11 He's learned counsel for Mr. Bailey. MR. SPIELFOGEL: Yes, I am. Good morning. 12 13 MR. FEINBERG: Your Honor, I have learned 14 counsel Jack Martin. Apparently he has not called in, and 15 he is not here. I don't know what his status or his preference is. 16 17 **THE COURT:** Okay. 18 MR. FEINBERG: It was suggested by the 19 marshals that the attorneys sit behind their clients in the jury box. So that's why I'm here. 20 21 THE COURT: That's fine. Anybody else want 22 to do that, that's fine. 23 MR. SCHARG: May I request that my client sit 24 behind me in the first row? 25 THE COURT: That will be fine. Go ahead.

MR. GRAVELINE: Good morning. So we set this status conference in September when we were talking about that there was going to be a superseding indictment in this case, we have superseded, a third superseding indictment, which has added three additional defendants and additional counts to both existing defendants and to the three new defendants as well.

Everyone now has been arrested and or made their initial appearances on at least one of the indictments in this case. There's a number of people who needs to be arraigned on the third superseding indictment, and if the Court is willing to do that, we can do that during this proceeding or we can handle it in duty court at 1:00, but I think we can have everyone arraigned on the third superseding indictment by end of the day today.

So with that, we just put out about 1,100 more pages discovery as of Friday. I talked to Mr. Anton today. I think we put that out Friday night. So it should be in the mail today and received today. That will be given out to defense counsel. We have additional discovery right now.

One of the tasks that we're going through is to make sure that all of the lab results, all of the -- any type of testing, any type of expert, I was going to prepare an expert witness notice for defense in this case

hopefully no later than December 15th, so that they know exactly who we might call in terms of experts, and what types of evidence might be presented by experts by December 15th, and I believe that we will have the majority of the discovery out in this case by the end of the year by December 31st in this case.

The issue that I think is going to come up from the defense perspective is a lot of the discovery, especially some of the things linking different defendants to Jencks material, and so that might not be coming. It might not be readily apparent how we're linking some of the defendants to certain shootings until we release Jencks, and that won't be until far closer to the trial, but I believe what we will be able to disclose anything non-Jencks will be done by December 31th in this case.

One of the things that I would like to do was propose prospective trial groups to the Court today, and essentially my methodology on this was to put anyone facing death eligible charges in the first group, and then fill in that group with defendants who are currently in custody.

So the proposed trial groups -- and clearly this is subject to both the Court's approval and defense counsel's objections -- but the proposed trial group that the government is going to put forward is in Trial Group

1, Billy Arnold, Quincy Graham, Robert Brown, Jerome Gooch, James Robinson and Matleah Scott.

Trial Group 2 would be Corey Bailey, Michael Rogers, Derrick Kennedy, Devon Patterson, Jeffrey Adams, and Arlandis Shy.

Trial Group 3 would be Steven Arthur, Eugene Fisher, Christopher Owens, Anthony Lovejoy, Diondre Fitzpatrick and Donnell Hendrix.

I think the one exception to the rule that I think immediately comes out is Corey Bailey, who we propose in Trial Group 2 is one of the death eligible defendants.

However, the reason we put -- or suggested Mr. Bailey in Trial Group 2 is he is serving a custodial sentence already in the Bureau of Prisons, and so while he has not been given a pretrial bond in this case, he's already in incarcerated on another case.

So if we're going to try to get somebody who is in pretrial custody case heard first, I thought that would be best to move one of the other defendants who is being held in pretrial incarceration before Mr. Bailey, and so that's why we put him in Trial Group 2 as oppose to Group 1.

I had a brief conversation this morning with the Court's case manager about what could possibly be some realistic trial dates in this case. We initially started looking at July, maybe toward the end of July for Trial

Group 1. I think based upon the Court's calendar, it appears that the third week of August would probably be a good trial date for Trial Group 1. I believe that would give us time to resolve the death legibility defendants and pretrial motions in this case. I anticipate at least a two month long trial, and so if we began in the third week of August, I would say trial would continue on until at least mid-October.

For Trial Group 2, based on that, I would suggest a mid-November trial date, and with a mid-November date, that would probably go to the middle of January, and then for Trial Group 3, a mid-February 2018 trial date.

THE COURT: When?

MR. GRAVELINE: Mid-February of 2018.

Now it's been my experience in these type of cases, sometimes people plead out in a six defendant trial group. So if someone in Group 2 wanted to have his case heard before mid-November and be part of Trial Group 1, we will be able to accommodate sliding people up into Trial Group 1. We will work to resolve some of the cases by pleas so we can have a better idea.

I don't know the Court's preference, but both myself and several of the defense counsel on this case have been part of large trials before. I think my only personal opinion, seven becomes the absolute far end of a

big trial can be and be effective, but if the Court wants less or more, I'll take whatever guidance you give on that, but we thought we would start with at least this initial group of six people.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Does the defense counsel have any comments on general concept of making death eligible defendants the -- and other in custody defendants up to comprise the first group for trial? Does anybody think that is a bad idea?

MR. FEINBERG: Jim Feinberg for Mr. Brown. Since Mr. Brown is just indicted on the death penalty eligible counts, learned counsel has been appointed, but he has not submitted his entire budget, and has not started proceedings as far as what learned counsel needs to do did, along with a litigation specialist and a paralegal since he is not either here or on the phone, I don't know how much time he is going project to be needed for his job.

So I can't say that the August trial date is realistic. I certainly have no objection if the death penalty eligible count is approved by DOJ, for Mr. Brown to be in Group 1, but if for some reason it is declined, I don't know, when he is going to be going ready, but based on that, I have no objection to being with Group 1 based on Mr. Martin's litigation specialist being ready with

everybody else Group 1 to be tried.

THE CLERK: Thank you. I might just ask, other than Mr. Spielfogel who is on the phone, any other learned counsel here?

MR. KOSELKE: Eric Koselke on behalf of Mr. Arnold. We would ask not to go with the first group for several reasons: Number one, as Mr. Graveline indicated, we don't have all the discovery yet in the case, and I think there's a potential -- I don't think it's definite yet -- for an additional superseding indictment or potential additional defendants. That all will affect our preparations.

I know I can speak on behalf of our defense team, we have had significant difficulty obtaining records. The more time we can get -- we're going to need more than the non-eligible capital defendants to prepare the capital phase, and therefore, we request to be placed in one of the later groups.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FEINBERG: Based on what he said, I believe Mr. Martin, who is my learned counsel, would probably want to do what was just suggested by prior counsel's client.

THE COURT: All right. My first reaction to the general question similar to what was just advanced by

learned counsel, that is that the process of deciding death eligibility or not, whether it is going to be withdrawn or not, from my prior experience, it is a pretty dragged out process, and now with the change of administration even more so, and in addition to the argument that mitigation evidence will have to be the subject of discovery, and in addition to the discovery otherwise required. So what is your reaction, Mr. Graveline?

MR. GRAVELINE: In terms of defense counsel being in collection of their own mitigation evidence, I can't speak to that. So if they need more time, they need more time. I can't speak to that.

In terms of interacting with Washington D.C., it's been my experience, less time is better. Making them make a decision is better then giving them, well, you don't have to make a decision until nine or 10 or a year from now. They will take nine months, 10 months, 11 months to make a decision because you've given them that much time.

That's why I proposed it this way. It's been my experience working with Washington D.C. on these types of issues, give them a deadline. Make them make a decision, and then they will usually make a decision. Washington D.C. is never going to make decision without us setting a deadline to make a decision.

THE COURT: I see.

MR. GRAVELINE: And I think flexibility is critical, and I definitely want to work with the defense teams on that.

On the flip side, if we need to flip Trial Group 1 and Trial Group 2 and move things around, I can understand that as well. It's just that my experience that setting -- you know, this is a firm trial date. This is when we need a decision to be made by. That advances the process as oppose to take away from the process.

MR. MINOCK: John Minock for Corey Bailey.

In this case we don't have all the discovery yet, and the breaking of the defendants into trial groups was just made known I think to the defense this morning.

Speaking for Mr. Bailey, I can't tell you now whether we have an objection or would seek a severance from any of the defendants in Trial Group 2, simply because we don't have all the information, and we haven't analyzed the case with the eye towards that yet.

So preliminarily, I don't have problem with it, but I want to be clear that depending on what we discover, there maybe a severance issue down the road.

MR. RATAJ: Mike Rataj on behalf of Mr. Graham.

I would echo Mr. Minock's comments regarding that

severance, and that I haven't looked at all of the discovery, but I also want to put on the record that my client has expressed his speedy trial rights. I can't tell you where we are on that right now. I have not calculated it, but if we go in August, we may have an issue with speedy trial issues.

THE COURT: All right. We have had the last of the defendants arrested and not yet arraigned?

MR. GRAVELINE: That's correct. We will complete arraignments, and I believe speedy trial clock starts today. The government will be making a motion to toll the speedy trial clock based on regarding the complexity of the case, some of the issues involved, the number of defendants, and motion practice.

So we will be submitting that motion, if not today, then by before Thanksgiving for the Court's consideration.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SEIKALY: Your Honor, Christopher Seikaly on behalf of Mr. Gooch.

I would join in on Mr. Rataj's statement. I have not gotten all of the discovery. There may be an issue to sever, and then we got people that are not even involved in any shootings or killings going to trial with someone who's a death penalty case, that kind of takes the other

defendants down because of the severity of the charges of the people who are assaultive and charged with the killings, and individuals that can't be tied to any of those. So that's an issue that we need to address.

THE COURT: We don't have -- I understand we don't have a written motion yet.

MR. GRAVELINE: For the speedy trial?

THE COURT: The whole determination of the groups.

MR. GRAVELINE: No, and so I'll put forth the motion in a written motion for the Court's consideration, and that will elicit a response from all defense counsel.

I will say this, in analyzing these trial groups, we thought about what would the evidence be? Would it change if -- could be less trial to Trial Group 2 as oppose to Trial Group 1.

Based upon our analysis, we believe the evidence is going to be the exact same in both -- at least the first two trials, because the shootings and the murders are all part of the RICO conspiracy. Everyone is charged in RICO conspiracy. Whether, for example, Mr. Arnold is sitting in Trial Group 1, the evidence of the shootings charged to Mr. Arnold is going to be part of the evidence on even Trial Group 2.

And so we believe that at least for the first two

trial groups, it's going to be almost a mirror image trial, both in the first trial and second trial.

THE COURT: On the other hand, we have -we'll have a considerable portion of the early trial
proceedings with the voir dire process and selecting
jurors who voice the ability and willingness to consider
the death penalty as an option in the case.

MR. GRAVELINE: If the death penalty is on that table, and when D.C. makes the decision, we'll know sooner rather than later, and then we can make more intelligence decisions if it comes back as this is a death eligible case. I agree with everybody. I think that changes how this case gets tried.

THE COURT: Okay. And we'll have at this point three?

MR. GRAVELINE: There are four people who have death eligible charges against them.

THE COURT: My suggestion for you as you look at this motion is to consider the possibility of just making the death eligible defendants a class of themselves, and we might very well get to the point of determining the death eligible decision on the case earlier rather than later, because we won't necessarily get tied up and distracted by other issues that will be shared in common with everyone. Just to consider that,

and then if you do and we reject that, we'll consider the 1 2 motion obviously that you will file. MR. GRAVELINE: All right. 3 THE COURT: What else should we be 4 addressing? 5 MR. GRAVELINE: I think that's it from the 6 7 government's point of view. 8 THE COURT: Okay. All right. For defense counsel, I know that I have some arraignments to conduct. 9 10 I will do that after we clear other issues that are upon 11 us. Ms. Mannarino? 12 MS. MANNARINO: Thank you. Maria Mannarino 13 on behalf of Mr. Arnold. There are a couple of issues that Mr. Arnold has 14 15 asked me to bring to the Court's attention, and asked for 16 some guidance from the Court. 17 Mr. Arnold has been requesting to be moved from 18 his present location of -- he's at the St. Clair County 19 There's a number of issues that have arisen from Jail. 2.0 the St. Clair County Jail that have proven to be a great 21 concern to him.

One of them has to do with issues that he had getting and being able to review the voluminous discovery material. He's been provided with his discovery on flash drives, but he's not been given access to it, and he's

22

23

24

25

been told that the flash drives have been lost. When he has requested time to review the materials, he has not been able to get that time. It's been extremely difficult to prepare and go through the material with him when he is not being given access to his discovery. Certainly, we're seeking guidance on that.

He's also been asking to be moved because of issues involving, quite frankly, threats that he has gotten there. Apparently, there are others who are located at that facility who -- and I'm not talking about the defendants in this case -- but others who are at the facility, quite frankly, he believes to be people who are alleged to be victims in this case or connected to alleged victims in this case who have been making threats, and so we're very concerned about that, and he's asking to be moved from that facility, from St. Clair. We're asking the Court to consider doing what it can get him moved to Milan.

Apparently, he's been told that one of the reasons he can't go is because of separation in this case, and we've asked, and we believe that it was at the request of the prosecutor, and we would ask the prosecutor to revisit that issue, because quite frankly, not all of the defendants need to be separated from each other. So we are asking the Court to revisit that issue of doing what

it can do get him to Milan for all of those reasons.

THE COURT: Thank you. Before we ask on this issue, Mr. Seikaly?

MR. SEIKALY: Just the issue that my client is at the Sanilac County Jail. In order to meet with him, it's two and a half hours up two, and two and a half hours back. There's no solitude for an attorney-client discussion to take place in privacy.

I would ask the Court to perhaps move Mr. Gooch to Milan. It's only 45 minutes away. It makes it a little bit easier to go more times to see him, because one of the complaints from Mr. Gooch is that I'm not giving him enough time in going up to see him enough, and I understand that. It's just you have to wipe out a day and a half.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Seikaly.

MR. KOSELKE: This is Eric Koselke. It's not a placement issue, and it may be appropriate for another discussion, but right now we have an informal agreement with the government to a proffer by February 15th. I know there's just been two additional death eligible defendants added to the case, and I assume there's going to be an extension on that time.

MR. GRAVELINE: Well, I can address what's been raised.

First, I will double check on this, but it's my understanding the only separation orders on this case right now -- I don't believe there's any separation orders between the defendants on this case. If there's any separation orders, it might be between any of the defendants and other people who are charged by the federal government in other cases, but I will double check on that. I don't believe there are any separation orders between the defendants, and if there is, I will double check that.

I know, for example, there's at least four or five of the defendants who are altogether at Sanilac right now, and so I will double check. If I'm wrong, I'm wrong, and I will double check, but it's my understanding there weren't any but I will double check.

MR. RATAJ: Mike Rataj on behalf of Mr. Graham.

There is a separation order, at least as to Mr. Graham and Mr. Arnold. That I know for a fact. I'm not sure as to any other defendants, but I know between my client and Mr. Arnold there is a separation order.

MR. GRAVELINE: Okay. I'll double check.

MS. MANNARINO: When the prosecutor says that he will check, will it be lifted?

MR. GRAVELINE: I will check as to each

defense counsel because some may have been separated from somebody else.

MS. MANNARINO: On behalf of Mr. Arnold, he has not made that request, and if we can get that lifted, that would be great.

**THE COURT:** Okay.

MR. GRAVELINE: I'll work on that issue.

In terms of the deadline submissions, if Ms.

Mannarino and Mr. Koselke are looking for additional time for Mr. Arnold, we can accommodate that.

I personally was viewing it because they have been in the case longer than the two new defendants -- well, Mr. Brown being new as a death eligible defendant -- and that those timelines are not necessarily hooked together at the same time. If I can, I want to resolve that issue for any defendant as quickly as I possible can. Figure out which way it's going to go. I don't figure those four defendants decisions being coupled together. If somebody is ready to submit and make a recommendation, let's get it done. If another two or three need additional time, then we'll give them additional time. I don't view those four as being a block that we will wait and give it all at one time to Washington D.C. The sooner we can resolve it, I think the better off we are in terms of everyone knowing the landscape of the case, and so if that's your request,

you're seeking additional time, we can do that. 1 2 MR. KOSELKE: Yes. MR. GRAVELINE: But if somebody else is ready 3 to go on February 15th, I more than welcome to that too. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right. 5 6 Anyone else with the placement issue? Okay. 7 Any other issues? Mr. Scharg? 8 MR. SCHARG: Henry Scharg. A couple of discovery issues, your Honor. First of all, it's my 9 10 understanding that although we have three groups with 11 scattered trial dates --12 THE COURT: We don't have that yet. We're 13 waiting for written motions, and then we'll seek your 14 input along with other defense counsel. 15 MR. SCHARG: The issue is that can I anticipate that when Jencks Act material is released to 16 17 the first group, that it will be released to all groups? 18 MR. GRAVELINE: I don't think so. I think 19 we'll be putting that Jencks material up pursuant to a protective order for each trial group. 20 21 MR. SCHARG: Second of all, as the Court 22 knows when we were first before the Court, we requested 23 the appointment of a discovery coordinator in this case. 24 It was part of our budget, and at that time he's servicing 25 all the defendants, and because of the fact that now with

2.0

the dissemination of all materials and added defendants, some of them death eligible, his budget is almost exhausted.

So we've had some discussion for the Court's consideration in that we're asking in terms of the non-death eligible attorneys, that the death eligible defendants submit their own budgets with Mr. Anton or another discovery coordinator so it doesn't further exhaust our budget, and to pick up part of the cost -- part of their expenses in their budget so we have more room. We will need more room based upon the disclosure from the government today that here's going to be at least two additional discovery dumps in this case. And as I've said, we've almost exhausted our budget for our coordinator because of the additional work that attorneys from the death eligible defendants have requested.

THE COURT: As it stands now, the coordinator is acting on behalf of all the defendants?

MR. SCHARG: Yes, and then for that reason he's exhausted almost his entire budget, and we've approached some of the learned counsel regarding that fact that when they approach the Court for their budget, they should include a discovery coordinator, Mr. Anton or someone else so that relieves us.

THE COURT: Have you talked to any of the --

MR. SCHARG: Yes. I wanted to bring it to your attention also so when they discuss their budgets, you will have that in mind.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MINOCK: John Minock for Corey Bailey.

I indicated to Mr. Scharg that I would be filing a motion to amend our budget for a discovery coordinator and paralegal. I also indicated to him that I am going to consult with Robert Rand, the Sixth Circuit budget attorney, regarding the way the Sixth Circuit wants to pay him, and we'll will be submitting an amended budget when I speak to him.

MS. MANNARINO: Maria Mannarino. On behalf of Mr. Arnold, we too will follow up in the appropriate manner.

THE COURT: Okay. Other than the arraignments, are there any other issues that you think we need to be address?

MR. GRAVELINE: No.

THE COURT: As it relates to placement, I think the first discussion should take place with the government, and I'm certainly willing to hear from counsel. We can do it by way of a telephone conference and have that recorded so that we don't need to wait for a hearing date to come up to address placement, but I think

logically the first discussion should be between counsel 1 2 and the government and see if you can work that out short 3 of my intervention. So for those of you who are going to be arraigned, 4 how many individuals do we have? 5 MR. SCHARG: Mr. Fisher. 6 7 THE COURT: So we have four. So we can do 8 that. 9 MR. GRAVELINE: Maybe we can just handle it 10 rights now before we excuse everybody. 11 THE COURT: Right. MR. GRAVELINE: So I believe first one is 12 13 Mr. Arthur, Defendant Number 2. MR. MCMANUS: John McManus on behalf of Mr. 14 15 We have provided the Court in advance of his acknowledgement of the third superseding indictment, and 16 17 we're prepared to proceed for indictment. 18 THE COURT: All right. So the Court has been 19 presented in this case with Mr. Arthur's acknowledgement of the third superseding indictment? 20 21 MR. MCMANUS: That's correct. 22 THE COURT: The charges are identified in 23 that acknowledgement, and so have you had the opportunity 24 Mr. McManus to go over the third superseding indictment 25 with your client?

1	MR. MCMANUS: I have, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: And you understand Mr. Fisher
3	(sic), you're charged in Count 1 of
4	MR. GRAVELINE: It's RICO conspiracy, your
5	Honor.
6	MR. MCMANUS: RICO conspiracy for Mr. Arthur.
7	THE COURT: And the maximum penalty for that
8	violation is up to life imprisonment, maximum fine of
9	\$250,000 provided by statute, you understand that?
10	<b>DEFENDANT ARTHUR:</b> Yes, sir.
11	THE COURT: Okay. In Count 25, the charge
12	MR. GRAVELINE: It's Count 32, and that's
13	924(c), possession of a firearm in furtherance of a crime
14	of violence, with a mandatory minimum of five years up to
15	life imprisonment and a \$250,000 fine.
16	THE COURT: Do you want to state the other
17	charges remaining?
18	MR. GRAVELINE: Those are two against
19	Mr. Arthur.
20	THE COURT: I see. Okay.
21	MR. GRAVELINE: Maybe you were looking at the
22	wrong acknowledgement. For Mr. Arthur, it is Count 1 and
23	Count 32.
24	THE COURT: I'm sorry. I was presented with
25	papers relating to more than one defendant. I'm sorry.

1	So we have two counts.
2	MR. GRAVELINE: That's correct.
3	THE COURT: And you understand the charges
4	from your discussion with Mr. McManus?
5	<b>DEFENDANT ARTHUR:</b> Yes, sir.
6	THE COURT: And you understand what the
7	maximum penalties are as recited?
8	<b>DEFENDANT ARTHUR:</b> Yes, sir.
9	THE COURT: The plea would be?
10	MR. MCMANUS: We stand moot, and ask the
11	Court to enter a not guilty plea and continue the bond.
12	THE COURT: All right. Any objection to the
13	request?
14	MR. GRAVELINE: No, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: The Court will continue the bond
16	and enter a not guilty plea for Mr. Arthur.
17	MR. MCMANUS: Thank you, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: You're welcome. You waive the
19	reading of the information?
20	MR. MCMANUS: Waive the reading.
21	MR. GRAVELINE: Next one is Mr. Fisher,
22	Defendant Number 3.
23	THE COURT: All right.
24	MR. SCHARG: Henry Scharg on behalf of Eugene
25	Fisher.

1	We acknowledge the third superseding indictment,
2	waive the reading, stand moot. We've also executed a copy
3	of the acknowledgement of the third superseding
4	indictment. I have gone over the charges with my client
5	and the maximum sentences that the Court could impose upon
6	him upon conviction, and he has signed his name to it. I
7	have gone over the third superseding indictment with him,
8	and have gone over acknowledgement with him.
9	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Fisher, you
10	understand what's been said?
11	DEFENDANT FISHER: Yes, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: You had a chance to go over the
13	third superseding indictment with Mr. Scharg?
14	DEFENDANT FISHER: Yes, sir.
15	THE COURT: You believe you understand the
16	charges?
17	DEFENDANT FISHER: Yes.
18	THE COURT: You understand the maximum
19	penalties that are applied to the charges?
20	DEFENDANT FISHER: Yes, your Honor.
21	THE COURT: And the minimum statutory
22	penalties as well?
23	DEFENDANT FISHER: Yes, your Honor.
24	THE COURT: Do you have any questions
25	concerning that?

**DEFENDANT FISHER:** No, your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. You're asking the Court to enter a not quilty plea on your behalf? 3 **DEFENDANT FISHER:** Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: The Court will do so. The 5 6 maximum penalty for Count 1 is up to life imprisonment and 7 a \$250,000 or both, you understand that? 8 **DEFENDANT FISHER:** Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Count 25 carries up to 10 years 10 imprisonment and a \$250,000 fine or both, you understand 11 that? 12 **DEFENDANT FISHER:** Yes, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Count 26 carries a maximum 14 penalty of 20 years in prison and up to a \$250,000 fine or 15 both, you understand that? 16 **DEFENDANT FISHER:** Yes, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Count 27 is carries up to 10 18 years in prison and a \$250,000 fine or both, you 19 understand that? 20 **DEFENDANT FISHER:** Yes, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Count 32 carries a maximum 22 penalty provided by statute of life in prison, minimum 23 penalty of -- I'm sorry -- five years in prison, maximum 24 of \$250,000 in fines or both, you understand that? 25 **DEFENDANT FISHER:** Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And Count 33 carries up to 10 1 2 years in prison, a \$250,000 fine or both, you understand 3 that? **DEFENDANT FISHER:** Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: And lastly Count 35, up to 10 5 years in prison, \$250,000 fine or both, you understand 6 7 that? 8 **DEFENDANT FISHER:** Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. GRAVELINE: The only other thing to add 11 from the government's point of view of Mr. Fisher is he 12 also is currently charged in a separate indictment 15-13 20751. That charge is now incorporated into the third 14 superseding indictment in this case. So we will be filing 15 a motion to dismiss that felon in possession in that separate indictment, which is in front of your Honor as 16 17 well. 18 So the Court can be anticipating a motion to 19 dismiss. 20 MR. SCHARG: We have no objection to that. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 MR. SCHARG: One final matter, your Honor. 23 We ask that bond be continued with the caveat that we will 24 be filing a motion to modify the conditions of bond. That

15-20652; USA v. BILLY ARNOLD, ET AL

will be in writing at a later time.

25

THE COURT: All right. Did you waive the 1 2 reading? 3 MR. SCHARG: We did. THE COURT: Thanks. The Court will continue 4 the bond. 5 6 MR. SCHARG: Thank you, your Honor. 7 Next is Mr. Gooch? 8 MR. GRAVELINE: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Seikaly. 9 10 MR. SEIKALY: We would waive the formal 11 reading of the indictment and stand moot. He has signed 12 the defendant's acknowledgement of the third superseding 13 indictment. We have reviewed the indictment together, and 14 he understands what charges are. 15 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gooch, you 16 understand what's been said? 17 **DEFENDANT GOOCH:** Yes. 18 THE COURT: And you believe that you 19 understand the charges that are made against you in this third superseding indictment, both in Count 1 and Count 20 21 32? 22 **DEFENDANT GOOCH:** Yes, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: And so you understand that the 24 maximum penalty for the violation charged in Count 1 is up 25 to 20 years in prison and a \$250,000 fine or both?

1	DEFENDANT GOOCH: Yes, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: And the maximum penalty in Count
3	32 is up to life in prison, and a maximum fine up to
4	\$250,000 or both, and that the a minimum sentence for the
5	violation in Count 32 is five years in prison, you
6	understand that?
7	DEFENDANT GOOCH: Yes, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: You have gone over the third
9	superseding indictment with Mr. Seikaly?
10	DEFENDANT GOOCH: Yes.
11	THE COURT: You believe you understand
12	charges that have been made against you?
13	DEFENDANT GOOCH: Yes, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Anything else that relates to Mr.
15	Gooch?
16	MR. GRAVELINE: Nothing.
17	THE COURT: All right. The Court will
18	continue the detention order, and enter a not guilty plea
19	to the charges.
20	MR. SEIKALY: Thank you.
21	MR. GRAVELINE: I had a conversation
22	Mr. Bailey's attorney, and we are prepared do his
23	arraignment at this time.
24	THE COURT: Mr. Spielfogel, is there anything
25	else that you want to weigh in on while you are on the

phone?

MR. SPIELFOGEL: No. I had things, but it seems to me all have been covered by other learned counsel and by Mr. Minock. I would just concur with them that we originally, per the Court's order -- have been trying to get this submission in shape by February 15th. That's been a real slow go. We're trying to get there. I would agree with Mr. Koselke that we will need more time than that, and with the additional death eligible defendants, it doesn't seem like that date will be realistic, but we will continue to work on it. We will get there as quickly as we can, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

MR. GRAVELINE: I'm delivering to the Court Mr. Bailey's acknowledgement.

THE COURT: Mr. Bailey is seated where?

Okay. So Mr. Minock?

MR. MINOCK: Yes, Judge. Waive the reading of the indictment I would note that Mr. Bailey has not received a copy of the indictment until this morning, but when I visited him last Thursday, we discussed at the time the details of it, and the changes from the second to the third superseding indictment. We are ready to proceed with the arraignment on those counts which he's charged.

THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Bailey, you had a

chance to review the third superseding indictment that 1 2 state the charges brought against you? **DEFENDANT BAILEY:** Yes, I have. 3 THE COURT: And you understand the nature of 4 5 the charges that are facing you? 6 **DEFENDANT BAILEY:** Yes, I do. 7 THE COURT: You understand that the charges 8 in Count 1 carries a maximum penalty of life in prison, \$250,000 fine or both? 9 10 **DEFENDANT BAILEY:** Yep. 11 THE COURT: And then Count 4, up to death 12 penalty or life in prison, and a \$250,000 fine or both, 13 you understand that? 14 **DEFENDANT BAILEY:** Yes, I understand. 15 THE COURT: Count 5, you're also facing 16 charges, if convicted, that's punishable by a maximum 17 penalty of death or life in prison, \$250,000 in fines or 18 both, you have understand that? 19 **DEFENDANT BAILEY:** I understand. 20 THE COURT: Count 6, you're facing up to 10 21 years in prison and a \$250,000 fine or both, you 22 understand that? 23 **DEFENDANT BAILEY:** Yes. 24 THE COURT: Count 7, up to 20 years in 25 prison, \$250,000 fine or both, you understand that?

1	<b>DEFENDANT BAILEY:</b> Yes, I understand.
2	THE COURT: Count 8, up to 20 years in
3	prison, \$250,000 fine or both, you understand that?
4	<b>DEFENDANT BAILEY:</b> Yes.
5	THE COURT: Count 9, up 20 years in prison,
6	\$250,000 fine or both, you understand that?
7	<b>DEFENDANT BAILEY:</b> Yes.
8	THE COURT: Count 10, up to 20 years in
9	prison, \$250,000 fine or both, you understand that?
10	<b>DEFENDANT BAILEY:</b> I understand.
11	THE COURT: Count 11, up to 20 years in
12	prison, \$250,000 or both, you understand that?
13	DEFENDANT BAILEY: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Count 12, 10 years to 10 year
15	mandatory minimum sentence up to life in prison, \$250,000
16	fine or both, you understand that?
17	DEFENDANT BAILEY: Yes.
18	THE COURT: And Count 32, minimum sentence of
19	10 years five years in prison and a maximum penalty of
20	life in prison, and a \$250,000 fine or both, you
21	understand that?
22	DEFENDANT BAILEY: Yes.
23	THE COURT: You understand you're asking the
24	Court to enter a not guilty plea for all of the charges?
25	<b>DEFENDANT BAILEY:</b> Yes.

1	THE COURT: And that you're waiving your
2	right to have the indictment read to you in its entirety
3	this morning, you understand that?
4	DEFENDANT BAILEY: Waiving?
5	THE COURT: Just waiving the right to have me
6	read the entire indictment to you, you understand that?
7	<b>DEFENDANT BAILEY:</b> I would like to hear I
8	didn't know I was waiving everything.
9	THE COURT: All right. You have a copy of
10	that indictment, sir?
11	DEFENDANT BAILEY: You say what?
12	THE COURT: You have a copy of the
13	indictment?
14	DEFENDANT BAILEY: Right here this
15	indictment. I see it.
16	THE COURT: I'm sorry?
17	<b>DEFENDANT BAILEY:</b> Yes, I have copy of the
18	indictment.
19	THE COURT: And you had a chance to discuss
20	it with Mr. Minock?
21	<b>DEFENDANT BAILEY:</b> We discussed it.
22	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. The Court
23	will enter a not guilty plea on your behalf.
24	MR. MINOCK: May I have a moment to confer
25	with my client please?

1	THE COURT: Sure.
2	DEFENDANT BAILEY: You ain't got to read it.
3	I understand. We went over it.
4	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.
5	Okay. The Court will enter not guilty plea as it relates
6	to each of the counts for Mr. Bailey.
7	Anything else?
8	MR. GRAVELINE: I believe that's everyone
9	or Mr. Rogers?
10	MR. MULLKOFF: Mr. Rogers is prepared. Doug
11	Mullkoff on behalf of Michael Rogers.
12	MS. MANNARINO: May we be excused?
13	THE COURT: Yes. You don't have an
14	arraignment?
15	MS. MANNARINO: We have already been
16	arraigned.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Rogers, have you had
18	an opportunity to go over the third superseding indictment
19	with Mr. Mullkoff?
20	DEFENDANT ROGERS: Yes.
21	THE COURT: And he has explained the nature
22	of the charges against you?
23	DEFENDANT ROGERS: Yes.
24	THE COURT: Mr. Mullkoff?
25	MR. MULLKOFF: There has been no changes as
	15-20652; USA v. BILLY ARNOLD, ET AL

1	applied to Mr. Rogers between the previous indictment and
2	this one. This indictment are Counts 1 and 32. 924(c) is
3	Count 32, and Count 1 is racketeering. We ask the Court
4	to enter a not guilty plea on his behalf, and we would
5	waive the formal reading of the indictment.
6	THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Rogers, you
7	understand if convicted on Count 1, the maximum penalty is
8	up to life in prison, \$250,000 fine or both?
9	DEFENDANT ROGERS: Yes.
10	THE COURT: As it relates to the charges in
11	Count 32, if convicted on the 924(c) violation, you would
12	face a mandatory minimum sentence of five years up to a
13	maximum of life in prison, \$250,000 fine or both?
14	DEFENDANT ROGERS: Yes.
15	THE COURT: And you are waiving your right to
16	have me read the charges?
17	DEFENDANT ROGERS: Yes.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Any questions that you
19	have?
20	DEFENDANT ROGERS: No.
21	MR. MULLKOFF: Thank you, Judge.
22	THE COURT: The Court will continue the
23	detention order, enter a not guilty plea to both
24	violations.
25	I think that's it. Anything else?

MR. GRAVELINE: That's it from the 1 2 government. 3 **THE COURT:** Okay. 4 5 (Proceedings concluded.) 6 CERTIFICATION 7 8 I, Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, official court 9 reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, appointed 10 11 pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States 12 Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is 13 a correct transcript of the proceedings in the 14 above-entitled cause on the date hereinbefore set forth. 15 I do further certify that the foregoing transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction. 16 17 18 s/Ronald A. DiBartolomeo May 9, 2019 19 Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, CSR Date Official Court Reporter 2.0 21 22 23 24 25